

REMARKS

Claims 4, 5, 24, 25, and 72-97 were pending in the application. Claims 4, 5, 24, 25, 72-79, 84-90, and 92 have been amended. Claims 80-83, 91 and 93-97 have been canceled. Claims 98-103 have been added. Therefore, claims 4, 5, 24, 25, 72-79, 84-90, 92, and 98-103 are now pending in this application.

Examiner Interview

Applicant's undersigned representative and the Examiner conducted a telephone interview on May 20, 2009, concerning the pending rejection. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time and consideration. The remarks below reflect the substance of the interview.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 4, 5, 24, 25, and 72-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Datta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,033) in view of Chiu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,767). Applicant submits that the amended claims are patentably distinct over the cited references as set forth below.

During the interview, the undersigned and the Examiner discussed an amendment similar to claim 4 as amended herein. The Examiner indicated that this amendment should overcome the present rejection.

Claim 4 now recites "displaying ... a graphical representation of a network including a first media aggregation manager and a second media aggregation manager." Claim 4 goes on to recite "the first and second media aggregation managers are configured to establish a single reservation protocol session that reserves bandwidth from a plurality of routers along a first of a plurality of paths between the first and second media aggregation managers" and that the media aggregation managers are further configured to "allocate the reserved bandwidth among a plurality of application sessions, each of which is between one of a first plurality of communication devices coupled to the first media aggregation manager and one of a second plurality of communication devices

coupled to the second media aggregation manager.” Applicant submits that none of the references teaches or suggests “media aggregation managers” as recited in claim 4.

Datta is directed to “techniques for evaluating network traffic capacity and evaluating alternative network configurations.” Datta 1:17-19. As the Examiner admits, “Datta fail[s] to disclose perform[ing] these functions with respect to the reservation and allocation of bandwidth.” Office Action at 5. Accordingly, Datta does not teach or suggest a “media aggregation manager,” as recited in claim 4, because Datta does not disclose “establish[ing] ... a single reservation protocol session” and “allocat[ing] the reserved bandwidth.” Chiu is directed to “Quality of Service (QoS) using Internet Protocol (IP) provisioning.” Chiu 1:9-10. While Chiu discloses “allocat[ing] bandwidth resources between service classes,” Chiu does not disclose that its allocating includes “first and second media aggregation managers” “establish[ing] a single reservation protocol session that reserves bandwidth from a plurality of routers along a first of a plurality of paths between the first and second media aggregation managers” and “allocat[ing] the reserved bandwidth among a plurality of application sessions.” Therefore, none of the references (individually or in combination) teaches or suggests the “media aggregation managers” as recited in claim 4.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 4 and its dependent claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. Independent claims 24, 76, 84, 93, and 98 (and their respective dependent claims) are believed to also distinguish over the cited references for at least reasons similar to those provided for claim 4.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

Applicant has petitioned herewith for what is believed to be the appropriate extension of time. If any further extensions are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/6057-44001/DMM.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

- ☐ Request for Continued Examination
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☒ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 25, 2009

By: /Dean M. Munyon/
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847